Collapsing the Conspiracy Myths about the World Trade Center Collapse

by Kenneth A. Kuhn
May 11, 2007

A friend of mine asked me to view a video (supposedly a documentary), *9/11 Mysteries* (which is available on Google), concerning conspiracy theories about the collapse of the World Trade Center. The video purports to make extensive use of science to show that the popular story is a myth to cover up a government conspiracy. My friend did not necessarily concur with the video but because I am an engineer my friend wanted me to review the science in the video and render an opinion. The following is my opinion based on my knowledge of the science of deception – the only science in the video.

The video is not a documentary. It can not be by definition. A documentary by definition is based on facts that can stand up to scrutiny. The writers state absolutely and unequivocally that the World Trade Center was wired for demolition and by long and drawn out innuendo infer that the demolition was very carefully coordinated with the terrorists months or even years in advance. Only preposterous suggestion is offered as proof. There are so many things wrong with the video that it would take hundreds of pages to point everything out. That exercise would be a waste of time. Trash is trash. A theme in the video is asking questions. So in the following I will ask questions. I could ask a lot more but I am trying to keep this brief.

1. If there was a plan to destroy the World Trade Center by businessmen and the government then why were airplanes needed to crash into the building. Why not just demolish the building with the thousands of tons of thermite that was supposedly planted in the buildings and then put out some press release by terrorists claiming responsibility?

2. How could the United States have so carefully coordinated the airplane crashes with the terrorists?

3. How could a survivor in the lower portion of one of the Towers be able to hear the noise and know that the floors above him were collapsing and then rush out of the building before being killed? He could set a world speed record!

4. We are told that if a camera shakes then that is proof that an explosion occurred. How?

5. We are told that white smoke is proof that thermite is being used. How?

6. The video contradicts itself – see question 1. Another story in the video states that after the airplane crashes that untold thousands of workers entered the building and strung up explosives to bring it down. They were able to prepare and wire every floor for computer controlled demolition in less than one hour. That is incredible. How did they do this?

7. How can a "survivor" from the 78th floor be able to describe the sound of the floors collapsing above him? How would he recognize the sound as that of collapsing floors? That must be the fastest person in the world! How did he get out alive?

8. Why is the drawing of the WTC complex showing building 7 so distorted? If one believes the scale then building 7 was at a remote distance and could not have been damaged by the collapse. Yet I have seen video that it suffered a severe direct hit by one of the towers. Interestingly, that footage was omitted for this video.

9. The video states absolutely that building 7 was wired for implosion after the towers fell and then imploded later that day, presumably to destroy evidence concerning WorldCom and Enron. I suppose the same demolition crew that wired both towers for implosion after the planes hit did this feat too? That is probably the greatest demolition crew in the world. The video suggests that it was the military. Yet, I have never seen nor even heard about any footage of military or other persons entering the building in mass. Why did this video not show any footage? Cameras were everywhere. As proof the video shows someone saying to pull the building – i.e. set off the explosives. Could "pull" have really meant to evacuate all rescue personnel? I happen to know for a fact that surveyors were called in to take measurements on the damaged building and that their advice was to get everyone out and clear the area because the building had a dangerous lean and would likely collapse. Why were explosives needed?

10. The story of the fired UL employee concerning UL "approval" of the steel is extremely suspect. UL does not approve anything. They only *list* something after their safety tests for fire, electrical shock, etc. I may have to check this as I have never heard of UL involvement in construction materials. What exactly was this fired employee trying to say? His story made no sense at all. If this is true then I can easily see why he was fired.

11. The video states that the fires after the airplane crash were few and scattered. If so then why was there so much smoke? Maybe all the fires I saw on the TV news were faked.

12. The video states that it would take around a minute and a half for a building the size of the World Trade Center to pancake using a simplistic model. Ergo, explosives had to have been used. So I am to believe that all I have to do to prove something is to carefully choose a model that can not work and then substitute my conclusion for the failure of the model? This is supposed to be science?

13. The video states numerous times that an open fire can not get hot enough to melt steel or even cause significant strength reduction. Thus any fire in the Towers could not have weakened the steel. In the area where I live there have been two incidents of an open fire from a crashed gasoline truck causing the collapse of a

steel bridge as the structure sagged and deformed from the heat. Is the video suggesting that the government had pre-planted thermite on the bridges and used a truck crash as a decoy for bringing the bridges down? Could it be that the truck crashes were rigged by the government to deceive the public concerning some ulterior motive for destroying the bridges? A contractor made a lot of money rebuilding the bridges so the contractor must have been in cahoots with the government. Ergo, that must prove this thesis.

I was taking notes as I viewed the video but I could not write fast enough to log all the bogus science I saw. Nor do I really care to waste time documenting all the trash. The following is just one of many examples of bogus science. In one incredible view looking up at one of the towers moments prior to the collapse a point is made about the sound of an explosion about one second prior to seeing the collapse. This is "scientifically" analyzed to "prove" that there was a deliberate explosion to initiate the collapse. Here is the truth – the sound is from the upper floors collapsing but that can not be seen from the angle of this particular video because of the smoke from the lower floors. The one second delay is because the upper floors are around one thousand feet above the microphone and sound travels about 1100 feet per second. Another myth shot down.

Here is the answer to the main question of the video. The video makes a big point that explosives were definitely used because it is impossible for such a building to collapse naturally as fast as it did – i.e. a free-fall collapse. The propagation of the impact forces through the lower structure as the upper floors collapse is much faster than velocities attained in free-fall acceleration and causes structural failure to occur ahead of the parts of the structure already broken. Thus, the collapse was occurring ahead of the falling debris as can clearly be seen in the various footage.

In short the video uses fake science to fool the public at large who are under the illusion (or is it delusion?) that they are knowledgeable about things they actually know less than nothing about. The tricks of the trade are very prominent. The following are some examples:

- Juxtaposition of time and place is used throughout to connect isolated "facts" that have little if any connection.

- A mixture of verifiable facts (relating to steel, fires in general, free fall dynamics, and acoustics) is used as is typical in these videos but those facts actually have little relevance to the thesis.

- Interviews with various "experts" (some real, some suspect) are used to strengthen the verifiable facts and thus infer strong connections to the faulty thesis of the video.

- Only "facts" positive to the thesis are shown. A true documentary would present opposing facts. When opposing facts are presented here they actually are not relevant. But clever narration can make them seem so.

Collapsing the Conspiracy Myths about the World Trade Center Collapse

The video makes the best use of smoke tricks I have ever seen. We are led to believe by various juxtaposition methods that the collapse is suspiciously similar to a pyroclastic volcano flow and controlled demolitions of large buildings. A volcano???????

The video opens with a bogus introduction by someone who claims (with particular emphasis) to be a Republican but who is now enlightened. That set off bogus alarms in my head from the start. Later, the video makes very brief references to President Bush, his family, and others in government in a pathetically weak attempt to link them to some design to destroy the World Trade Center. That was the absolute most bogus and amateurish part of the video. A professional video maker would either have not included that or have expounded on the supposed connections. To merely state that someone happened to be in the area or had legitimate business connections to some prominent person in the months prior to the collapse and then infer a conspiracy is bogus to the extreme. About 18 months before the tragedy I personally had a fantastic view of the World Trade Center from a plane I was riding on preparing to land. Does this mean that I am connected to it?

I could go on for a long time but this is enough. I proclaim the video to be pure trash not worthy of any note. The only value of the video is to demonstrate the well known methods of deception used by various video makers to dupe the public at large. Its ad-nausium hour and a half length length makes it particular torture. I knew more than I needed to after fifteen minutes but I watched it in its entirety just to see how bad it would get – and it got very bad. It is ironic that the thesis of the video is that we have been deceived.

At the end of the video where one would expect to find credits and sources of information one only sees a statement to the effect that material from various sources was used under the "fair use" doctrine of U.S. copyright law. This is classic for an amateurish production. There is a long list of mostly nameless people involved.

I have viewed a number of conspiracy "documentaries" ranging from space aliens to Waco to one-world government. All use the same deceptive methods to paint a story that is pure fiction. I have studied how to spot these methods so the flaws are obvious to me. All such videos depend on the viewer being gullible to planted thoughts and not having knowledge of actual science or methods. My advice is that anytime you see a conspiracy "documentary" assume that it is bogus. You will be right at least 99.99 percent of the time.